## REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated December 1, 2004. Claims 2, 4-6, 8-9 and 16-23 have been canceled. Thus, claims 1, 3, 7, 10-15 and 24-25 are now pending.

Claim 1 stands rejected under Section 102 as being allegedly anticipated by Fujii. This Section 102 rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 requires a layer stack including a metallic layer comprising Cr under and contacting a metallic reflective layer comprising Al. Fujii fails to disclose or suggest this. Fujii discloses the use of chromium ***oxide*** under a reflective layer, but not a metallic layer comprising Cr under an Al reflective layer. Fujii thus cannot achieve the advantages discussed in the context of the instant application, and is unrelated to the invention of amended claim 1. Claim 13 defines over Fujii in a similar manner.

Claim 1 also stands rejected under Section 102 as being allegedly anticipated by Iacovangelo. This Section 102 rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 requires "a metallic layer comprising Cr that is from about 15 to 70 Å thick, wherein the metallic layer comprising Cr is located directly under and contacting the metallic reflective layer comprising aluminum in order to improve at least durability of the first surface mirror, and wherein the reflective layer reflects incoming light away from the substrate before the incoming light reaches the metallic layer comprising Cr, a low-index dielectric layer comprising silicon oxide and having an index of refraction of from about 1.4 to 1.8, located over the metallic reflective layer comprising aluminum; a high-index dielectric layer having an index of refraction of from about 2.2 to 2.6 located over the low-index dielectric layer; the first surface mirror is located in a projection television apparatus, and the first surface mirror reflects at least about 85% of incoming visible light at about 550 nm." Iacovangelo fails to disclose or suggest the aforesaid aspects of claim 1.

Iacovangelo allegedly discloses in Fig. 8 a stack of $Cr/Al/MgF_2/SiO_2$. Iacovangelo expressly states that the upper two layers (i.e., $MgF_2/SiO_2$) must have a modulated refractive index profile to control amplitude, bandwidth, and wavelength of rejection bands of the radiative layer (e.g., col. 3, lines 7-14; col. 5, lines 9-56; col. 6, lines 4-25). However, Iacovangelo clearly fails to disclose or suggest the sue of such a high-index material having an index (n) of from about 2.2 to 2.6 as called for in claim 1. There is nothing in Iacovangelo which discloses or suggests this. Furthermore, Iacovangelo fails to disclose or suggest a metallic layer comprising Cr from about 15 to 70 Å thick as called for in claim 1. For at least this second reason, the cited reference is unrelated to the invention of claim 1.

Citation to additional art cannot overcome the fundamental flaws in the art cited above. All claims are in condition for allowance. If any minor matter remains to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with regard to the same.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By: _____
Joseph A. Rhoa
Reg. No. 37,515

JAR:caj
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100